UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/800,631	03/16/2004	Akihisa Nakamura	016907-1620	9687

22428 7590 07/02/2007

FOLEY AND LARDNER LLP
SUITE 500
3000 K STREET NW
WASHINGTON, DC 20007

EXAMINER	
LI, AIMEE J	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2183	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
07/02/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/800,631	NAKAMURA, AKIHISA	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Aimee J. Li	2183	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *16 March 2004 and 18 November 2004*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-11* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-11* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *18 November 2004* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *3/16/04*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-11 have been considered.

Papers Submitted

2. It is hereby acknowledged that the following papers have been received and placed of record in the file: Specification (Not in English), Drawings, Oath or Declaration, and IDS as filed 16 March 2004 and Specification, Claims, Abstract, and Drawings as filed 18 November 2004.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claims 1-3 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being taught by Kucukcakar et al., U.S. Patent Number 6,138,229 (herein referred to as Kucukcakar).

5. Referring to claims 1 and 11, taking claim 1 as exemplary, Kucukcakar has taught a processor system comprising:

a. A fixed processing unit having a predetermined information processing function (Kucukcakar Abstract "...The instruction execution unit (**34**) has a non-programmable section (**46**)..."; column 2, lines 25-41 "...Datapath **16** has both a non-programmable data path **18** and a programmable datapath **32**..."; Figure 1; Figure 2; and Figure 3);

b. A variable processing unit having a variable information processing function (Kucukcakar Abstract "...The instruction execution unit (**34**) has...a programmable section (**48**)..."; column 2, lines 25-41 "...Datapath **16** has both a non-programmable data path **18** and a programmable datapath **32**..."; Figure 1; Figure 2; and Figure 3); and

c. A control unit which controls so as to cause the fixed processing unit to process a provided task, or so as to cause the variable processing unit to process the task after newly setting an information processing function of the variable processing unit (Kucukcakar column 2, line 42 to column 3, line 25 "...Opcode values are received by a controller or instruction execution unit **34**..."; column 4, lines 36-55 "...transferred via selector logic circuit **49** to CONTROL BUS **15** for controlling datapath **16**..."; Figure 1; Figure 2; and Figure 3).

6. Claim 11 has similar limitations to claim 1 and is rejected for similar reasons. The only difference is claim 11 is for a method while claim 1 is for a processor.

7. Referring to claim 2, Kucukcakar has taught the processor system according to claim 1, wherein the control unit analyzes the provided task, and controls so as to cause the variable processing unit to process the task after newly setting an information processing function of the variable processing unit in accordance with a result of the analysis (Kucukcakar column 2, line 42 to column 3, line 25 "...Opcode values are received by a controller or instruction execution unit **34**..."; column 3, lines 48-67 "...Selector logic circuit **49** selects either the control signals from non-programmable section **46** or programmable section **48** for transfer to datapath **16**...";

column 4, lines 36-55 "...transferred via selector logic circuit **49** to CONTROL BUS **15** for controlling datapath **16**..."; Figure 1; Figure 2; and Figure 3).

8. Referring to claim 3, Kucukcakar has taught the processor system according to claim 1, wherein the variable processing unit has at least one of an ALU, a MAC, a LUT, and a FIFO (Kucukcakar column 4, lines 49-55 "...the logic gates in programmable datapath **32** can be configured to function as...an Arithmetic Logic Unit (ALU)..."; Figure 1, Figure 2, and Figure 3), and realizes a new information processing function in accordance with connection information provided from the control unit (Kucukcakar column 2, line 42 to column 3, line 25 "...Opcode values are received by a controller or instruction execution unit **34**..."; column 4, lines 36-55 "...transferred via selector logic circuit **49** to CONTROL BUS **15** for controlling datapath **16**..."; Figure 1; Figure 2; and Figure 3).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. Claims 4-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kucukcakar et al., U.S. Patent Number 6,138,229 (herein referred to as Kucukcakar), as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Ing-Simmons et al., U.S. Patent Number 5,239,654 (herein referred to as Ing-Simmons).

11. Referring to claim 4, Kucukcakar has not taught the processor system according to claim 1, wherein the fixed processing unit and the variable processing unit are provided as a plurality

of sets in accordance with a plurality of image signals, and respectively process said plurality of image signals in parallel. However, Kucukcakar has taught a DSP (Kucukcakar column 1, lines 33-43 "...DSP processors have circuitry to handle such tasks as complex mathematical processing and video image generation...") which processes images, but not the exact layout of the entire chip, just the specifics of a processor's datapath. Ing-Simmons has taught a processor system according to claim 1, wherein the fixed processing unit and the variable processing unit are provided as a plurality of sets in accordance with a plurality of image signals, and respectively process said plurality of image signals in parallel (Ing-Simmons column 1, line 51 to column 2, line 17 "...Such imaging systems are prime candidates for multi-processing where different processors perform different tasks concurrently in parallel..."; column 2, line 54 to column 3, line 2 "...designing a multi-processing system to handle image processing and graphics...when the processors are operating in the MIMD mode. When the processors are running in the SIMD mode..."; column 62, line 21 to column 63, line 13 "...embodiment of the system which is the subject of this invention..."; Figure 61; Figure 62; Figure 63; and Figure 64). In regards to Kucukcakar in view of Ing-Simmons, Kucukcakar only teaches the details of a specific datapath within a processor, but not the details of the entire processing system. Ing-Simmons has taught the details of the entire processing system, such as those shown in Figures 61-64, without the details of the datapath and why a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would want to use the entire system. A person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, and as taught by Kucukcakar, would have recognized that the SIMD/MIMD structure allows a very high degree of flexibility to satisfy constantly changing criteria (Kucukcakar column 2, lines 32-41 "...The architecture must allow a very high

degree of flexibility..."). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the SIMD/MIMD architecture of Kucukcakar in the device of Ing-Simmons to increase flexibility of the system.

12. Referring to claim 5, Kucukcakar in view of Ing-Simmons has taught the processor system according to claim 1, further comprising:

a. A plurality of co-processors (Ing-Simmons column 1, line 51 to column 2, line 17 "...Such imaging systems are prime candidates for multi-processing where different processors perform different tasks concurrently in parallel..."; column 2, line 54 to column 3, line 2 "...designing a multi-processing system to handle image processing and graphics...when the processors are operating in the MIMD mode. When the processors are running in the SIMD mode..."; column 62, line 21 to column 63, line 13 "...embodiment of the system which is the subject of this invention..."; Figure 61; Figure 62; Figure 63; and Figure 64) having the fixed processing unit, the variable processing unit and the control unit (Kucukcakar column 2, line 42 to column 3, line 25 "...Opcode values are received by a controller or instruction execution unit **34**..."; column 4, lines 36-55 "...transferred via selector logic circuit **49** to CONTROL BUS **15** for controlling datapath **16**..."; Figure 1; Figure 2; and Figure 3);

b. A main processor which preferentially processes the task (Ing-Simmons column 6, lines 5-19 "...there is a set of parallel processors **100-103** and a master processor **12**..."; column 6, line 59 to column 7, line 43 "...master processor **12** is shown connected to the memories via crossbar switch **20**. Transfer processor

11..."; column 13, line 14 to column 15, line 5 "...The master processor...is used for scheduling and control of the entire system..."; Figure 1; and Figure 4); and

c. An arbitrating unit which analyzes the task, and allocates the task to said plurality of co-processors in accordance with a result of the analysis (Ing-Simmons column 6, lines 5-19 "...there is a set of parallel processors **100-103** and a master processor **12**..."; column 6, line 59 to column 7, line 43 "...master processor **12** is shown connected to the memories via crossbar switch **20**. Transfer processor **11**..."; column 13, line 14 to column 15, line 5 "...The master processor...is used for scheduling and control of the entire system..."; Figure 1; and Figure 4).

13. Referring to claim 6, Kucukcakar in view of Ing-Simmons has taught the processor system according to claim 5, wherein the arbitrating unit analyzes the task, and in accordance with a result of the analysis, determines whether the task is allocated to only the main processor or the task is allocated to the main processor and said plurality of co-processors (Ing-Simmons column 6, lines 5-19 "...there is a set of parallel processors **100-103** and a master processor **12**..."; column 6, line 59 to column 7, line 43 "...master processor **12** is shown connected to the memories via crossbar switch **20**. Transfer processor **11**..."; column 13, line 14 to column 15, line 5 "...The master processor...is used for scheduling and control of the entire system..."; Figure 1; and Figure 4 – In regards to Ing-Simmons, the Master processor receives all instructions and controls transferring and scheduling accordingly, including which processor, itself or one of the other co-processors, executes which instruction.).

14. Referring to claim 7, Kucukcakar in view of Ing-Simmons has taught the processor system according to claim 5, wherein the arbitrating unit calculates a processing time in a case of

analyzing and processing the task by only the main processor, and on the basis of the calculated time, determines whether or not the task is processed by only the main processor (Kucukcakar Abstract "...processor (**10**) implements complex, time-consuming operations..." and column 2, lines 12-24 "...processor implements complex, time-consuming operations..." and Ing-Simmons column 9, line 10 to column 10, line 7 "...The operation characteristic of a SIMD operation is that at any period of time a relatively small amount of the data with respect to the entire image is being operated on...").

15. Referring to claim 8, Kucukcakar in view of Ing-Simmons has taught the processor system according to claim 1, wherein the variable processing unit has a function of carrying out filtering processing on image information to be provided (Ing-Simmons column 1, line 51 to column 2, line 17 "...Such imaging systems are prime candidates for multi-processing where different processors perform different tasks concurrently in parallel..."; column 2, line 54 to column 3, line 2 "...designing a multi-processing system to handle image processing and graphics..."; column 9, line 10 to column 10, line 7 "...The operation characteristic of a SIMD operation is that at any period of time a relatively small amount of the data with respect to the entire image is being operated on..."; column 62, line 21 to column 63, line 13 "...embodiment of the system which is the subject of this invention..."; Figure 61; Figure 62; Figure 63; and Figure 64).

16. Referring to claim 9, Kucukcakar in view of Ing-Simmons has taught the processor system according to claim 1, wherein the variable processing unit has a function of carrying out identification processing on image information to be provided (Ing-Simmons column 1, line 51 to column 2, line 17 "...Such imaging systems are prime candidates for multi-processing where

different processors perform different tasks concurrently in parallel..."; column 2, line 54 to column 3, line 2 "...designing a multi-processing system to handle image processing and graphics..."; column 9, line 10 to column 10, line 7 "...The operation characteristic of a SIMD operation is that at any period of time a relatively small amount of the data with respect to the entire image is being operated on..."; column 62, line 21 to column 63, line 13 "...embodiment of the system which is the subject of this invention..."; Figure 61; Figure 62; Figure 63; and Figure 64).

17. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kucukcakar et al., U.S. Patent Number 6,138,229 (herein referred to as Kucukcakar) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Sasaki et al., U.S. Patent Number 4,758,885 (herein referred to as Sasaki). Kucukcakar has not explicitly taught the processor system according to claim 1, wherein the variable processing unit has a function of carrying out color conversion processing on image information to be provided. However, Kucukcakar has taught processing images (Kucukcakar column 1, lines 33-43 "...DSP processors have circuitry to handle such tasks as complex mathematical processing and video image generation..."). A person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, and as taught by Sasaki, would have recognized that the color image processing of Sasaki obtains a high quality color image from various input systems (Sasaki column 1, line 65 to column 2, line 11 "...the color reproducing ranges of the input and output systems differ as well, a high quality image can be reproduced...obtain a high quality color image..."). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the color processing of Sasaki in the device of Kucukcakar to improve image quality.

Conclusion

18. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure as follows. Applicant is reminded that in amending in response to a rejection of claims, the patentable novelty must be clearly shown in view of the state of the art disclosed by the references cited and the objections made. Applicant must also show how the amendments avoid such references and objections. See 37 CFR § 1.111(c).

a. Sugiura et al., U.S. Patent Number 4,679,074, has taught image processing with color conversion.

b. Balmer, U.S. Patent Numbers 5,197,140; 5,339,447; 5,758,195; 5,809,288; 5,881,272; 5,933,624; and 6,038,584; Gove et al., U.S. Patent Numbers 5,212,777; 5,371,896; 5,471,592; 5,522,083; 5,592,405; 5,606,520; 5,613,146; 5,696,913; 5,768,609; 6,070,003; 6,260,088; and 6,948,050; Balmer et al., U.S. Patent Number 5,226,125; Ing-Simmons et al., U.S. Patent Number 5,239,654; and Gove, U.S. Patent Numbers 5,410,649, have all taught an image processing system with a controller determining which mode, SIMD, MIMD, or hybrid, to operate in.

c. Kogge, U.S. Patent Number 5,475,856; Barker et al., U.S. Patent Numbers 5,590,345; 5,717,943; and 5,794,059; Wilkinson et al., U.S. Patent Numbers 5,630,162; 5,805,915; 5,870,619; 5,878,241; 5,966,528; and 6,094,715; and Dapp et al., U.S. Patent Number 5,734,921, have taught an array processor with controller capable of SIMD, MIMD, and SISD functionality.

d. Taylor et al., U.S. Patent Number 5,664,214, has taught a controller for determining MIMD or SIMD modes of operation.

e. Muthujumaraswathy et al., U.S. Patent Numbers 6,279,045 and 6,810,434, have taught reconfigurable and non-reconfigurable processors.

f. Mori et al., U.S. Patent Application Publication 2002/0181765 and U.S. Patent Number 7,039,233, have taught an image processor capable of SIMD and MIMD functionality.

19. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Aimee J. Li whose telephone number is (571) 272-4169. The examiner can normally be reached on M-T 7:00am-4:30pm.

20. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Eddie Chan can be reached on (571) 272-4162. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

21. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Aimee J Li
Examiner
Art Unit 2183

24 June 2007

Aimee J. Li
6/25/2007